

**COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND PURCHASING**  
(Standing Committee of Berkeley County Council)

**Chairman:** Mr. Robert O. Call, Jr., Council District No. 3

A **meeting** of the **COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND PURCHASING**, Standing Committee of Berkeley County Council, was held on **Monday, September 13, 2010**, in the Assembly Room of the Berkeley County Administration Building, 1003 Highway 52, Moncks Corner, South Carolina, at 6:20 p.m.

**PRESENT:** Chairman Robert O. Call, Jr., Council District No. 3; Committee Member Phillip Farley, Council District No. 1; Committee Member Timothy J. Callanan, Council District No. 2; Committee Member Cathy S. Davis, Council District No. 4; Committee Member Dennis L. Fish, Council District No. 5; Committee Member Jack H. Schurlknight, Council District No. 6; Committee Member Caldwell Pinckney, Jr., Council District No. 7; Committee Member Steve C. Davis, Council District No. 8; County Supervisor Daniel W. Davis; Ms. Nicole Ewing, County Attorney; and Ms. Barbara B. Austin, Clerk of County Council.

In accordance with the Freedom of Information Act, the electronic and print media were duly notified.

Chairman Call: "I'd like to call the Committee on Public Works and Purchasing Committee meeting to order. First item on the agenda is the approval of minutes from August 9, 2010 and August 23, 2010."

Committee Member Pinckney: "Move for approval"

Committee Member S. Davis: "Second"

Chairman Call: "I have a motion and a second. Any corrections or additions to these minutes? (No Response) Hearing none, I will call for the vote. All in favor say Aye? (Ayes) All opposed Nay? (No Response) The Ayes have it."

It was moved by Committee Member Pinckney and seconded by Committee Member S. Davis to **approve** the minutes as presented. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

Chairman Call: "Next on the agenda"

**A. Consideration of a Resolution designating surplus property of Berkeley County and authorizing the disposal of the surplus property.**

Chairman Call: "Mr. John Hamer"

Mr. John Hamer, Procurement Director: "Thank you Mr. Chairman. These are the heavy equipment that is in Roads & Bridges Department this year for disposal. We want to declare them surplus. When it is time, we want to dispose of them. It's three pieces."

Committee Member Fish: "Mr. Chairman?"

Chairman Call: "Mr. Fish"

Committee Member Fish: "Mr. Hamer, number two on that is a 94 Caterpillar motorgrader. I thought we traded than in on one of those that we just bought?"

Mr. Hamer: "No sir, not this one. This is the one that is in this year's budget."

Committee Member Fish: "Was there a trade in on the two that you already purchased? We purchased two already this year."

Mr. Hamer: "We purchased one last year. There was a grader that we disposed of last year. I can't remember if it was a trade in or we sold on GovDeal. This is the one in this year's budget that we just approved a bid last month and it has been ordered. So we will dispose of this one once that one comes in. Either as a trade in or we will put on GovDeal to see which one has the better price."

Committee Member Fish: "I'm a little confused because number one, part of the bid process and the selection for that was based on two items, response time, trade in and guaranteed buy back."

Mr. Hamer: "The trade in was optional on the last bid. It was not part of the evaluation. We put that on there only for information only to either trade it in or to sell on GovDeals. It was used as an option, not as part of the evaluation."

Committee Member Fish: "I need to go back and pull that out to look. I thought I remember where that was part of the total price purchase where you gave them credit for each one of those on that trade in."

Mr. Hamer: "That was listed on the tab sheet, but it was listed as an optional."

Chairman Call: "Any more discussion?"

Committee Member Schurlknight: "Just for clarification, John, on the option as I was reading it. That was at a time where we were going to dispose of the piece of equipment that if we got a better deal as a trade in versus Gov.Deals, whatever we would go with the trade in. It would give a little wiggle room at the end. Am I correct?"

Mr. Hamer: "We did both. We sold some on Gov.Deal and we used one as a trade in. I can't remember if it was the grader or not, but we did trade one in. But the rest of them we used on Gov.Deal. We got a better price."

Committee Member Fish: "Mr. Chairman. I agree with you on that Mr. Hamer, but number one, I'm going to go back and dig that package out. But if I recollect on the last ones, that was part of the total dollar price in that. If we are not doing that....."

Mr. Hamer: "It was listed on the tab sheet, but if you look at the heading, it says...."

Committee Member Fish: "I understand it was listed there. But that was part of the selection process on total price was all of these five or six items including the trade in."

Mr. Hamer: "It was on the original bid that we did but when we went back to Council we worked the bid package, we chose that as optional or not as part of the evaluation."

Committee Member Fish: "I need to dig that package out, if not, I'll ask you to take a look at that again. Thank you"

Committee Member Pinckney: "Move for approval"

Committee Member S. Davis: "Second"

Chairman Call: "I have a motion and a second. Any discussions? (No Response) All in favor say Aye? (Ayes) All opposed Nay? (1 Nay) The Ayes have it."

It was moved by Committee Member Pinckney and seconded by Committee Member S. Davis to **approve a Resolution designating surplus property of Berkeley County and authorizing the disposal of the surplus property.** The motion passed by majority voice vote of the Committee. Committee Member Fish voted Nay.

Chairman Call: "Next on the agenda is..."

**B. Mr. Frank Carson, PE, Berkeley County Engineer,** Re: Request for variance/waiver of development standards, Westminster Heights, Goose Creek.

Mr. Carson: "Thank you Mr. Chairman. We have come to you before from time to time to deal with waiver requests in municipalities that are not subject to our subdivision regulations we apply when we review plans and approve construction that we are going to accept for maintenance, we apply those same development standards, but because they are not subject to our subdivision regulations, the waiver or variance process doesn't exist for those and so Council had approved a process to bring that to you for those requests. This particular item deals with Westminster Subdivision off of Plantation North Boulevard. Construction has been substantially complete for about 10 years now, but for various reasons, the developer did not bring it in to compliance to be accepted for maintenance and one of the...we have been working

with the developer and particularly with the City of Goose Creek to bring them in to compliance and have that accepted and we think we are almost there. There is one issue dealing with the center lines of the streets. Our requirement is that it be at or above the 10 year flood elevation. At the time this was developed, there were not flood maps available for that area and in the mean time those maps are now available and we find that a portion of one of the streets does not meet that requirement. We have had discussions with the City and the developer about the process. The engineer has provided a request to the City. You have that March 29<sup>th</sup> letter and the City in turn has requested the variance from that standard in the July 16, 2010 letter.”

Chairman Call: “Mr. Daniel Ben-Yisrael is here. Would you like to add something? He is the Planning/Zoning Administrator for the City of Goose Creek. He is here in support of this change.”

Committee Member Pinckney: “Mr. Chairman”

Chairman Call: “Mr. Davis”

Committee Member Pinckney: “No this is Pinckney”

Chairman Call: “Oh, Mr. Pinckney, I didn’t see down there.”

Committee Member Pinckney: “I’ve got two questions Mr. Carson. First of all, you said this was 10 years ago that the developer did not bring it into compliance. Is that correct?”

Mr. Carson: “That is correct”

Committee Member Pinckney: “What can we do in the future to alleviate that? Is there anything that we can do to alleviate the extended period of time for them not coming into compliance?”

Mr. Carson: “In the county, our Subdivision Regulations have been changed so that now there is a two year warranty period and a bond. In general, the City now...I don’t know if the City has changed their ordinance, but at least that requirement is in place for those streets. Typically that doesn’t happen anymore or either they have to forfeit that warranty bond.”

Committee Member Pinckney: “And my final question is, by granting this variance, is there any safeguard that we need to think about or any legal thing out there to hamper us?”

Mr. Carson: “No sir, by and large, the flood management responsibility falls to the City. It won’t affect any of the residences. The finished floors are well above. It just deals with some flooding in the street and that technical requirement.”

Committee Member Pinckney: “Thank you sir. Move for approval”

Committee Member S. Davis: “Second”

Chairman Call: "I have a motion and a second. Any discussions? (No Response) Hearing none, I will call for the vote. All in favor say Aye? (Ayes) All opposed Nay? (No Response) The Ayes have it. Thank you Mr. Carson and Mr. Ben-Yisrael. We appreciate you coming up here."

It was moved by Committee Member Pinckney and seconded by Committee Member S. Davis to **approve a Request for variance/waiver of development standards, Westminster Heights, Goose Creek.** The motion passed by unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

**C. Mr. Daniel C. Thrower, Roads and Bridges Manager, Re: Standardization of a Walking Excavator.**

Mr. Thrower: "Thank you Mr. Chairman. The Roads & Bridges Department owns and operates many types of heavy equipment. In our fleet we have three very unique types of equipment called walking excavators. These machines can operate in drainage areas that are very small space with minimum disturbance. We've owned and operated nine walking excavators since 1983. Eight of those are the Menzi Muck brand. Basically, we have been standardized with Menzi Muck for the last 18 years. Most recently in 08-09 budget was approved for sole source with the Menzi Muck brand. Before you, we are requesting for walking excavators to the models manufactured by Menzi Muck. Some of the benefits and advantages is reliability, durability, advantage of dealer parts and repair, service experience because we have those types for our maintenance shop to work on so many years, operator experience, familiarity with that type of machine. Menzi Muck also has a training center in Florida that a lot of operators have been to. We have two A61 Menzi Mucks already in our fleet and have a A70 that we would like to replace with the same model, so you are talking about the same model situation too. We've budgeted and approved the budget for \$217,000. The budget has been approved for \$217,400 for the purchase of a walking excavator and we would like to recommend to Council for the standardization of the walking excavator manufactured by Menzi."

Committee Member Schurlknight: "Mr. Chairman?"

Chairman Call: "Yes"

Committee Member Schurlknight: "Danny, all of those are great reasons for standardization. I can understand all of that. I guess the main thing is price. What do we have in place to make sure that we are getting a good price on the machine when we sole source it?"

Mr. Thrower: "Actually, when we first purchased the 08 Menzi Muck A61, I got a price. There are two dealers that we know of in the United States that sell this type of machine, Menzi Muck and Kizer. The Kizer machine, I got a quote from back in 08 and it was at least \$10,000 more than the purchase of the one we made and the machine that they quoted me from Kizer was actually less horsepower, 25 horsepower less and a lighter machine. So we feel like Menzi has been very competitive in pricing."

Chairman Call: "Any further questions?"

Committee Member Callanan: "Mr. Chairman?"

Chairman Call: "Mr. Callanan"

Committee Member Callanan: "So when we bid these things out, there are two people who usually come back and respond to them for two manufacturers of the product?"

Mr. Thrower: "Well, we haven't really bid out a walking excavator. When I did it in 08, all I did was get a price. We didn't bid it out. I just asked for a quote from the Kizer manufacturer, but it was approved, like I said, as a sole source for Menzi."

Committee Member Callanan: "But my understanding is that the new bid spec takes all of those items into consideration with regards to quality, service contracts, all of that. Wouldn't they come out on top anyway?"

Mr. Thrower: "They might but the bottom line is what we are looking at is that this machine has been in our fleet for years and to try to go out for a bid in the time frame and just being able to acquire one for the same model, which is an A61 to make our fleet complete. Not only would it be the same brand but the same model to be a unique machine that our operators are very familiar with, would be what we are looking for."

Committee Member S. Davis: "Move for approval"

Committee Member Pinckney: "Second"

Chairman Call: "I have a motion and a second. Any further discussions? (No Response) Hearing none I will call for the vote. All in favor say Aye? (Ayes) All opposed Nay? (1 Nay) The Ayes have it."

It was moved by Committee Member S. Davis and seconded by Committee Member Pinckney to **approve the Standardization of a Walking Excavator**. The motion passed by majority voice vote of the Committee. Committee Member Callanan voted "Nay".

**D. Mr. Steve Hively, Director of Operations, Re: Corrosion and Odor Control System.**

Mr. Hively: "Yes sir, we have evaluated four different companies to provide odor and corrosion protection or treatment systems for our system. In this proposal we enhanced what we have been doing to a more encompassed area of the county or of the system. In that evaluation we recommend Fog Free Technologies as the best value for our proposal. This, of course, is subject to their 120 day trial, which we will evaluate the effectiveness of the product against background information that we have and also their performance. I will add on that, the budget shows \$240,000. That is for a 365 day period. This first year will end next June, so it will be

less than that for this particular year and then for the next four years, this will be the price that their chemicals would be provided for.”

Chairman Call: “Any questions for Mr. Hively?”

Committee Member S. Davis: “Where they the lowest bidder in relationship to the bids that you received?”

Mr. Hively: “Yes sir. They were the lowest cost. It is difficult. The evaluation was based on cost, highly weighted on cost. However, we also looked at the technology and what they were recommending to use. It wasn’t just cost, but they were the lowest cost.”

Committee Member S. Davis: “Also, I see as a condition that if the product failed to produce as represented, ya’ll have a policy or provision where ya’ll can terminate this contract.”

Mr. Hively: “Yes, we can terminate the contract with 30 days notice any time we want too.”

Committee Member S. Davis: “Ok”

Committee Member Farley: “When will this 120 days start?”

Mr. Hively: “After approval by Council, which I guess would be in 2 weeks, then we will give them the notice to proceed to start the trial.”

Committee Member Farley: “This is just the manhole on Rose Drive?”

Mr. Hively: “This is three places. Two pumping stations and one manhole. We’ve selected that because this is a test area that we have used before and we have good background information to be able to evaluate the performance.”

Committee Member S. Davis: “Mr. Chairman. Did the other bidders also were willing to submit to this conditional aspect of their contract?”

Mr. Hively: “Yes. Everyone had the same proposal and the same conditions. There were no qualifications on any of their proposals.”

Committee Member S. Davis: “But, we can terminate the contract?”

Mr. Hively: “Yes sir.”

Committee Member S. Davis: “Move for approval”

Committee Member Pinckney: “Second”

Chairman Call: "I have a motion and a second. Any further discussion? (No Response) Hearing none, I will call for the vote. All in favor say Aye? (Ayes) All opposed Nay? (No Response) Motion carries. Thank you Mr. Hively."

It was moved by Committee Member S. Davis and seconded by Committee Member Pinckney to **approve** awarding the contract for the **Corrosion and Odor Control System to Fog Free Technologies** in the amount of \$240,785.67 . The motion passed by unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

Chairman Call: "This item was held in Committee on August 9, 2010 for a month."

**E. Consideration of a Resolution** setting fees for a Stormwater Service Fee to fund implementation of the Stormwater Management Ordinance.

Mr. Carson: "This is....we have not made any changes. I think the reason for holding this in Committee was to give the public a chance to have more time to review. There are a couple of points that I want to make this evening. I think from some of the questions that have come up, I think there is some misunderstanding about what this is and what it isn't. This is not a stormwater utility fee. This is a fee for the review of development plans in Zone 1. Zone 1 is the....for stormwater purposes, it is the MS4 Regulated Area. In other words, we are covered under a Phase 2 NPDES permit in the urbanized area. Our ordinance is adopted basically the same zone as the affected zone in the Transportation Impact Fees, which means from the Cooper River west to the county line and north to Cypress Swamp, which contains the urbanized area according to the 2000 census and also contains the area of the highest growth in the County. The County is required to implement Phase 2 regulations. In essence, we are performing the same plan review and inspection duty that OCRM and DHEC have been performing in those areas and have been charging fees for low these many years and continue to in all the other zones in the County. This is not something that developers should see as a new fee. It is a fee that is somewhat different in structure we think for our needs, but it is not a new fee that has not been charged in the past. It has not been charged in Berkeley County because again, when we passed the ordinance in 2007, it provided for these fees, but the rates had to be adopted by Council and that is why we are here tonight."

Committee Member Schurlknight: "Mr. Chairman"

Chairman Call: "Mr. Schurlknight"

Committee Member Schurlknight: "Frank, if I could just ask a question? You are talking about the OCRM has always been charging this fees that are going out to these projects and stuff. Is that to say, let me back up....my main concern is individual houses, agricultural, sheds, those types of things going up. I know we discussed it a little bit the last few weeks on that. I'm just concerned about them having to go through the rigamarole of another fee. I don't have a problem with big parking lots, developments, those types of things. The reason I'm saying this is that they get hit hard right now with that Transportation Impact Fee and I just hate to see us add something else to that pile of fees that is in Zone 1."



Mr. Carson: "I guess the other point I didn't quite get to is this doesn't change the work that we have to do. What this fee does is help us capture some funds to pay for those review services so the guy building the shed, we still have to review those plans. We still have to do the inspection. We still have to sign off on the project. This is a way to pay for it. Right now, we are doing the work. When we do that you certainly can have an exemption and there are exemptions for...in other jurisdictions for a number of activities.."

Committee Member Schurlknight: "But they still have to pay the fee to get the...for you to come out and look at it to give the exemption."

Mr. Carson: "Well, that is what this...the exemption would go into the table. We just wouldn't charge the fee. So they are exempt. We still have to do the work. We are still going to have those costs. They are still going to have to be paid for presumably out of the general fund or somebody else's fees."

Committee Member Schurlknight: "That is my next question. I'm trying to get it clear in my mind. By the regulations we have to do this. We have no choice. We've got to do this. That is number one. Second thing is we've got to make a decision whether we want to make it a user fee or just everybody in the whole county pay to offset the cost. There are two ways to go as far as funding it."

Mr. Carson: "Yes sir, again, ever since we've covered by the Phase 2 permit, these costs have been covered under the general fund. We have for the past two years in our budgets for the Stormwater Management Department, included the collection of fees. We have not collected those fees because we have not reached this point and gotten the fees approved. Mr. Pinckney, I think asked the question at the last meeting, 'Did we know what we would have collected had we had the fees' and we went back through fiscal year 09-10 at the projects in that area and calculated it's approximately \$40 to \$50,000 collected in fees. That includes, we talked about possible exemptions. That includes sites under a ½ acre. I think there were five sites where the \$4,000 cap would have come into play. All those things taken into consideration, that would have been the fees collected."

Committee Member Schurlknight: "At what point in this process do we identify our exemptions, like you were talking about?"

Mr. Carson: "This is it. The table attached shows what would be collected. If you were going to have exemptions they would need to go in that table or in the resolution."

Chairman Call: "Did somebody else...."

Committee Member S. Davis: "Mr. Chairman, yes just briefly. Frank, if I understand you, the developers are paying this in other areas? We are last to do so. It covers the urban area from the Cooper River on back toward Hanahan and in that direction, not to pick on Hanahan, but Goose Creek. Any urban area? Currently now the general budget has been paying this cost

which is spread to everybody. The proper people that you are submitting tonight that should be carrying this minimum cost that they are paying in other development is the developers.”

Mr. Carson: “That is correct”

Committee Member S. Davis: “Well, I move for approval.”

Chairman Call: “I have a motion. Let me ask another question before we....if you will withdraw your move, Mr. Davis, I would like to ask more questions.”

Committee Member Pinckney: “Let me go ahead and second and then we can go ahead...”

Chairman Call: “That will be fine too. Mr. Carson, are these fees that are now being paid, are they, you say we will be getting these fees for work that DHEC or OCRM once did? I believe that is what you said.”

Mr. Carson: “They charge fees. They still charge fees if you are outside of this area, you still have to pay their fees. They are not structured exactly like these, because they do the review in those areas.”

Chairman Call: “They have been charging for this up until now.”

Mr. Carson: “They still charge when they do the work. But in that area, we are doing that work now.”

Chairman Call: “So, whoever is paying these fees will be paying them to us, instead of them, if we are doing the work. Is that the way....OK. Is this the stormwater runoff that results in retention ponds and things like that? Is that what we are talking about? Controlling the water, controlling the stormwater before it leaves the site at the pre-development rate. Is this what we are talking about?”

Mr. Carson: “That is a part of it. There are essentially three components. There is the erosion sediment control during the construction. There is a water quality that is both during construction and post construction and the water quantity, what we would typically call flood prevention or drainage design.”

Chairman Call: “Any more discussion?”

Committee Member Callanan: “Mr. Chairman”

Chairman Call: “Mr. Callanan”

Committee Member Callanan: “Frank, you had mentioned that you had calculated out that if these fees were in place last fiscal year, I think it was last fiscal year that you just quoted,

they would come out to \$40 something dollars. I know we transferred over \$6,000 but that was just to cover the shortfall. Do you have any idea what the expense would be had we...in total for that same period of time? Just so you know where I'm going with this question, you want to make sure that the fee is not excessive, so you want to make sure that the fee is not exponential of our actual cost, then it becomes a revenue generator and I just want to make sure that it's somewhat close to that."

Mr. Carson: "We don't track our expenses. We don't keep timesheets and charges and those kind of things. One thing we did and I'll say Clint Busby the Deputy County Engineer is here and he's the one that primarily manages this program for the County. We talked today about what is the time required in these various categories in it. It varies a lot depending on the quality of the submittal, I would say as much as anything in the time we spend. Again, looking at what those costs are, I just did a sort of a quick calculation about what our costs is in terms, I call it payroll costs, in other words, the salary and benefit type multiplier, not a general overhead. These are generally a bit...these wouldn't quite cover those costs. But it is in the range. I will give you an example, we were looking at say a 5 acre site at say 24 hours or so to review, is gonna be close to \$900, just as a round number. It can vary dramatically so, that is going to be up around \$750 at 5 acres."

Committee Member Callanan: "Ok. I just wanted to make sure that they were close. I'm sure there are some cases where there is such a small amount of time that there might be a little overation. Hopefully, it all balances out."

Mr. Carson: "I guess that probably worst would be the inspection part of it. That is really the critical part. All the plans in the world are not going to make a construction project."

Committee Member Callanan: "Thank you."

Committee Member Pinckney: "One final question, Frank. You stated about the urban areas. Does this apply to rural unincorporated areas as well?"

Mr. Carson: "Well, in the rural areas, those are still under OCRM and DHEC review."

Committee Member Pinckney: "OK"

Mr. Carson: "I guess one of the other points is, is that we are at the end of a permit cycle. So, in the next 12 to 24 months, DHEC is going to be issuing a new permit and from what we know, they don't make these things up. There is a lot of pressure from the EPA about what the model permit is and what's going to be required. It's going to be a whole new world for us, I'm afraid."

Committee Member Pinckney: "Ok, thank you."

Committee Member Schurlknight: "Just one moment, Mr. Chairman. Frank, do you foresee the rural area coming in under this here. I think you just said urban."

Mr. Carson: "I would say eventually. DHEC really wants to get out of the business of doing this kind of work. I mean, they push, that was part of what our permit appeal was about three years ago, four years ago now. Them trying to get rid of those responsibilities and put them on local government."

Committee Member Schurlknight: "So, right now, we are just looking at the urban areas right now? This is the schedule you were talking about where the exemptions would go. We should have a little bit of time to look at some exemptions further such as rural and those areas. That will be fine. Thank you."

Committee Member S. Davis: "Frank, do you think they will ever get rid of...give ya'll the responsibility for septic tanks in the rural part of the county? Septic tanks?"

Mr. Carson: "Mr. Davis, I always like to say the easiest problem to solve is the one we don't have yet. That is the one that we don't have yet."

Chairman Call: "I would submit that we are happier to have that agency out of our business than they are to have somebody else take it. Much better to do these things on a local level if we can. I have a motion and a second. Is there any further discussions? (No Response) Hearing none, I will call for the vote. All in favor say Aye? (Ayes) All opposed Nay? (No Response) The Ayes have it."

It was moved by Committee Member Pinckney and seconded by Committee Member S. Davis to **approve** a **Resolution** setting fees for a **Stormwater Service Fee** to fund implementation of the **Stormwater Management Ordinance**. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

It was moved by Committee Member Schurlknight and seconded by Committee Member S. Davis to **adjourn** the Committee on Public Works & Purchasing meeting. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

The meeting ended at 6:52 pm.

October 11, 2010  
Date Approved

**PUBLIC WORKS AND PURCHASING**  
(Standing Committee of Berkeley County Council)

Chairman: Mr. Robert O. Call, Jr., District No. 3

Members: Mr. Phillip Farley, District No. 1  
Mr. Timothy J. Callanan, District No. 2  
Mrs. Cathy S. Davis, District No. 4  
Mr. Dennis Fish, District No. 5  
Mr. Jack H. Schurlknight, District No. 6  
Mr. Caldwell Pinckney, Jr., District No. 7  
Mr. Steve C. Davis, District No. 8  
Mr. Daniel W. Davis, Supervisor, ex officio

A meeting of the **COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND PURCHASING**, Standing Committee of Berkeley County Council will be held on **Monday September 13, 2010**, at **6:00 p.m.**, following other scheduled committee meetings in the Assembly Room, Berkeley County Administration Building, 1003 Highway 52, Moncks Corner, South Carolina.

**AGENDA**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**August 9, 2010**

**August 23, 2010**

**A. Consideration of a Resolution designating surplus property of Berkeley County and authorizing the disposal of the surplus property.**

**B. Mr. Frank Carson, PE, Berkeley County Engineer, Re: Request for variance/waiver of development standards, Westminster Heights, Goose Creek.**

**C. Mr. Daniel C. Thrower, Roads and Bridges Manager, Re: Standardization of a Walking Excavator.**

**D. Mr. Steve Hively, Director of Operations, Re: Corrosion and Odor Control System.**

**HELD IN COMMITTEE AUGUST 9, 2010 FOR ONE MONTH:**

**E. Consideration of a Resolution setting fees for a Stormwater Service Fee to fund implementation of the Stormwater Management Ordinance.**

September 8, 2010

S/Barbara B. Austin, CCC

Clerk of County Council